DO STUDENT VALUES AT HONOR CODE SCHOOLS CHANGE FROM FRESHMAN TO SENIOR YEAR?

A Thesis
by
MICHELLE MARIE NAVAS

Submitted to the Graduate School
Appalachian State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

December 2010
Department of Human Development and Psychological Counseling

DO STUDENT VALUES AT HONOR CODE SCHOOLS CHANGE FROM FRESHMAN TO SENIOR YEAR?

A Thesis
by
MICHELLE MARIE NAVAS
December 2010

APPROVED BY:

James Lancaster, Ed.D
Chairperson, Thesis Committee

Peter M. Wachs, Ed.D
Member, Thesis Committee

Diane Waryold, Ed.D
Member, Thesis Committee

Lee Baruth, Ed.D
Chairperson, Department of Human Development and Psychological Counseling

Edelma D. Huntley, Ph.D
Dean, Research and Graduate Studies

ABSTRACT

DO STUDENT VALUES AT HONOR CODE SCHOOLS CHANGE
FROM FRESHMAN TO SENIOR YEAR?
(December 2010)

Michelle Marie Navas, B.S., Davidson College

M.A., Appalachian State University

Chairperson: James M. Lancaster

This study examined whether student values at honor code schools changed from freshman to senior year and also if the values reported by students at honor code schools were significantly different from previously collected value data. Student values at two honor code schools were measured using the Values Arrangement List created by Dr. John P. Golden, a business professor at Florida Gulf Coast University. The instrument asked students to rank various values in a set of 42 forced choice questions. Twenty-one of the questions pertained to operational values, which are values associated with day-to-day operations. The other 21 focused on life values, which are values related to achieving more long-term goals and ways one aspires to be. After collecting an aggregate list of value rankings for the two honor code schools, the values were compared from freshman to senior year to see if any significant differences existed both for operational and life values. No significant differences were found for life values. For operational values, there were significant differences in the importance of *drive* and *competency*. Seniors ranked *competency* higher than freshmen and freshmen ranked *drive* higher than seniors. When comparing the value rankings to the norm values collected by Golden (2006), no

significant differences emerged in operational values. However, significant differences occurred for life values. Freshmen ranked *fellowship, social service*, *community,* and *aesthetics* higher than the norm group. Freshmen also indicated a lower preference for *health, self worth,* and *fame* than the norm group. Seniors ranked *fellowship, social service, community,* and *aesthetics* more highly than the norm group. Additionally, seniors ranked *self worth*, *health*, *achievement, wealth,* and *fame* lower than the norm group.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

DEDICATION

For my family, friends, mentors, professors, and everyone else that believed in my ability to succeed: I dedicate this thesis to you. Thank you for your unconditional love and support.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the Office of Student Research at Appalachian State University for providing me with funding to support my research and make this project possible. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. John Golden who donated a significant number of surveys to help make my research possible. Finally, I would like to acknowledge Dr. James Lancaster as well as the rest of my thesis committee for all of the time that they put in to helping make this project a success.

DO STUDENT VALUES AT HONOR CODE SCHOOLS CHANGE FROM FRESHMAN TO SENIOR YEAR?

Chapter 1: Introduction and Literature Review

In the past decade, academic dishonesty has become a large topic of interest especially since the current research shows that in various studies up to 95% of college students have self-reported incidents of academic dishonesty (McCabe & Trevino, 1997). On the other hand, research by McCabe, Trevino, and Butterfield (1999) has shown that honor codes are an effective strategy in lowering levels of academic dishonesty on college campuses. McCabe et al. (1999) believe that honor codes have been effective in the past because in these codes cheating is defined more clearly and code schools are more likely to discuss values surrounding academic integrity with their students. While McCabe et al. (1999) found that attitudes about cheating are similar across campuses, it is currently unknown whether students' values influence their decision to cheat or not. While this study will not be able to answer the aforementioned question, it will begin to tackle it by examining freshman and seniors' values at honor code schools to determine first if there is a difference in values from freshman to senior year, and second if students' values at code schools differ from previously collected normed values.

History of Cheating

In 1964, William Bower conducted one of the first multi-campus studies regarding cheating on college campuses. In this study, approximately 75% of students self-reported having cheated (McCabe & Trevino, 1997). Thirty years later in their 1997 study McCabe and Trevino found that levels of self-reported cheating had increased. In addition, McCabe and Trevino (1997) found that more varieties of cheating were occurring. Students were collaborating on assignments when asked not to and were

failing to cite other's ideas when paraphrasing (McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 2001). In 1992, The Center for Academic Integrity (CAI) was established in order to create more dialogue about academic integrity in higher and secondary education (*History*, n.d.).

Individual and Contextual Influences

Research seems to suggest that the majority of cheating occurs because of external pressure to succeed from family, future employers, and graduate schools (McCabe et al., 1999). In one study, McCabe and Trevino (1997) found that contextual variables explained twenty-one percent of variance whereas individual factors only explained nine percent. Prior to the 1990's, most research focused on individual factors that affected cheating (McCabe et al., 2001) In addition, the majority of studies were conducted at only one institution so the research was limited in that it could not be generalized to the larger population (McCabe et al., 2001). Subsequent research by McCabe and Trevino (1997) has indicated that various individual and contextual factors influence a student's inclinations to cheat in college. McCabe and Trevino (1997) identified five individual factors that had a direct correlation with academic dishonesty. These factors were a student's age, GPA, parents' education, participation in athletics, and involvement in extracurricular activities. In addition, research by Davis, Pierce, Yandell, Arnow, and Loree (1995) suggests that there may be a correlation between Type A/B personalities and cheating. People with Type A personalities are described as competitive, aggressive, hostile and easily aroused, while Type B personalities are more laid-back and patient than their Type A counterparts (Davis et al., 1995). According to their research, Type A students report less cheating than Type B students although Type

A students are more inclined to cheat when they perceive a loss of control or excessive pressure (Davis et al., 1995).

Besides the individual factors, McCabe and Trevino (1997) found that peer behavior, particularly behavior that they role modeled in regards to academic integrity, and peers' attitudes towards academic integrity, especially disapproval, affected students' levels of academic dishonesty. Additionally, involvement in fraternities and sororities was also an important contextual factor that influenced students' levels of academic dishonesty. Other factors that have also been found to influence cheating include: parental pressure, pressures to find a job, a need to succeed, poor self-image, and a lack of personal integrity (McCabe et al., 2001).

Individual influences.

While there is not a specific student profile that can be identified as that of a cheater, McCabe and Trevino (1997) did find that students with certain individual characteristics were more likely to cheat than others. Age was the first important individual characteristic that played a role in levels of academic dishonesty. McCabe and Trevino (1997) found that younger students were more likely to cheat than older students. Gender has also been identified as a factor that may influence cheating; however, research is mixed on whether or not there is a disparity in levels of academic integrity between males and females since the research shows that women are more likely to respond to surveys about academic integrity than men (McCabe & Trevino, 1997). In McCabe and Trevino's 1997 study, 65% of the respondents were female (McCabe & Trevino, 1997). One multi-campus study suggested that females cheat less than males,

but McCabe and Trevino (1997) suggest that this disparity is due to individual differences and influences on the campuses studied, not gender.

Students with lower grade point averages (GPA) have also been found to cheat more than those with higher GPA's (McCabe & Trevino, 1997). This finding has been consistent across studies. Researchers believe that this occurs because students with lower GPA's have "more to gain and less to lose" (McCabe & Trevino, 1997). In addition, research conducted by Bower (1964) and Kirkvliet (1994) found differences in the correlation between educational levels of parents and levels of academic dishonesty (as cited in McCabe & Trevino, 1997). Bower (1964) found a negative correlation between high levels of education and academic dishonesty, while Kirkvliet (1994) found a positive correlation between a high level of parental education and academic dishonesty (as cited in McCabe & Trevino, 1997). McCabe and Trevino (1997) were skeptical of Kirkvliet's (1994) study, which only looked at one institution; however, their own research also showed a positive correlation between highly educated parents and academic dishonesty. This positive correlation may be due in part to high expectations placed on the student by their highly educated parents.

In their 1997 study, McCabe and Trevino also found that college athletes were more inclined to cheat than non-athletes. They hypothesized that this might be because athletes come to college for reasons other than academics (McCabe & Trevino, 1997). Finally, involvement in extracurricular activities directly correlated to higher levels of academic dishonesty (McCabe & Trevino, 1997). McCabe and Trevino (1997) found that the more students were involved in campus extracurricular activities the more likely they were to cheat and the less committed they were to academics. They believe that the

positive correlation between involvement in extracurricular activities and academic dishonesty occurs because students' time is more consumed by their extracurricular involvement and therefore they are more likely to engage in cheating to keep up with their academics (McCabe & Trevino, 1997).

A study by Davis et al. (1995) found that there were discrepancies in the levels of self-reported cheating by Type A and Type B personality types. The research suggests that Type B personalities were more likely to report higher levels of cheating. However, Davis et al. (1995) found that when put under enough stress Type A personalities were also inclined to cheat. Types of stress that seemed to affect levels of cheating for Type A personality types were a perceived loss of control or excessive pressure (Davis et al., 1995). This research affirms findings that show that external pressures to succeed play a large role in the levels of student cheating**.**

Contextual influences.

In addition to individual factors, there are also several contextual factors that seem to influence student levels of academic dishonesty including: involvement in fraternities and sororities, peer behavior and peer disapproval. In their research, McCabe and Trevino (1997) found that students involved in fraternities and sororities self-reported higher levels of cheating than their non-Greek peers. They believe this is because fraternities and sororities are environments in which peer approval is important, so peers can have a large influence on behavior (McCabe & Trevino, 1997). This leads into the second contextual factor that McCabe and Trevino (1997) identified in their research: peer behavior. McCabe and Trevino (1997) found that students who knew of others that cheated and linked new success to their cheating were more likely themselves

to cheat. They attribute this to Bandura's (1986) social learning theory, which says that behavior is learned through modeling. McCabe and Trevino (1997) claim that Bandura's (1986) theory should be the framework for academic dishonesty research. Along similar lines, research also shows that if students perceive their peers to approve of cheating, then students will begin to absorb similar attitudes towards cheating (as cited in McCabe & Trevino, 1997). These findings are consistent with social learning theory that says that behaviors that are likely to be learned in a social setting are those that are "likely to be approved or disapproved by significant others" (McCabe & Trevino, 1997, p. 392). Therefore, peer approval or disapproval of cheating can have a strong influence on whether or not students engage in acts of academic dishonesty on their campus. Besides external pressure to succeed, overall McCabe and Trevino (1997) believe that these peer-related contextual factors are the most influential for students' decisions to cheat or not to cheat.

Perceptions of Cheating

Students.

One frequently asked question is, "How do students perceive cheating on their campuses?" Research by McCabe et al. (1999) found that attitudes towards cheating are generally the same across campuses of both honor code (code schools) and non-honor code (non-code schools) schools. Students at both code schools and non-code schools said that they believed cheating was wrong. In this same study by McCabe et al. (1999), students were asked open-ended questions about the academic integrity culture on their campus. They found that students at code schools talked about academic integrity differently than their non-code counterparts (McCabe et al., 1999). Students at code

schools were more likely to say that the honor code was an integral part of the campus culture and frequently mentioned being "part of a special community" (McCabe et al., 1999). In addition, students at both code and non-code schools spoke about the pressure to succeed on their campuses, which is frequently cited in the academic integrity literature as an important component that influences students to cheat or not (McCabe et al., 1999). In addition to having similar attitudes towards cheating as their code counterparts, non-code students expressed belief that a quasi-honor code system could possibly work on their campuses (McCabe et al., 1999). In fact, beyond believing that it could work, students were interested in having their institutions pursue this avenue and establish some semblance of an honor code (McCabe et al., 1999).

Faculty.

When McCabe and Trevino (1997) surveyed faculty members about their awareness and understanding of the academic policy on their campus they found that the majority of faculty were either unfamiliar with the policies or they chose to avoid dealing with academic dishonesty cases. This lack of understanding and avoidance of the issue poses a problem for institutions given that the research suggests that students are less likely to cheat when faculty understanding of the policy is higher (McCabe & Trevino, 1997). This is probably related to the fact that faculty who are more aware of the academic policy are more likely to discuss academic integrity with their students in the classroom. At both code schools and non-code schools, faculty report preferring to handle academic integrity infractions themselves without going through the formal process set in place by their institution (McCabe et al., 2001). In these cases, punishments for violating the academic integrity code are typically less severe than college and university conduct

system punishments that usually result in a failing grade for the assignment on which the student cheated (McCabe et al., 2001). Faculty members at code schools believe that students are more aware of and have a better understanding of the academic integrity policies. In addition, they believe that faculty should support students by educating them about the academic integrity policies and enforcing the policies in place (McCabe et al., 2001). In addition to faculty understanding of academic integrity policies being low, faculty members tend to underestimate levels of academic dishonesty on their campuses (Singg, Thomas, & Null, 2005). According to Singg et al. (2005), 71% of faculty reported that 30% or less of students cheat, when in reality the number of students cheating, on average, is 50% or higher.

Honor Codes

Numerous studies have found that honor codes tend to be an effective way of reducing cheating on college campuses (McCabe & Trevino, 1993; McCabe et al., 1999). McCabe et al. (1999) believe the effectiveness of these codes is due in part to their clearer definitions of cheating, placing more responsibility on the students to detect violations, and encouraging students to preserve privileges granted to them through honor codes. According to McCabe and Trevino (1997), to be considered an honor code campus an academic policy must consist of an honor pledge, a peer reportage clause, unproctored exams, and a peer-run honor council. The CAI broadens this definition further by stating that an honor code must contain three or more of the following elements: the code should be student initiated and operated, monitored by a student-run judicial board, have a single sanction for violations of the code, contain a non-toleration clause or peer reportage

clause, and/or require a signed pledge, honor code education session or test before a student's work can be graded (*Honor code 101*, n.d.).

McCabe et al. (1999) believe the effectiveness of an honor code lies in the campus culture. In fact, research has shown that honor codes are more effective when they are embedded in the campus culture (McCabe et al., 2001). Code schools usually have some sort of ceremony during orientation or the first week of classes that conveys the importance of the honor code to the incoming students (McCabe et al., 2001). Since community participation is important for buy-in, an honor code must recognize and respect the currently existing traditions and cultural system of a campus (Dufresne, 2004). Students at code schools reported highly valuing their honor code and viewed it as a privilege (McCabe & Trevino, 2002). In addition, McCabe et al. (1999) found that students at code schools generally showed stronger ethics in the work place, which implies that honor codes may have a long-term benefit.

While it is hard to create a community that supports integrity from scratch, research has suggested that there are other options that can improve levels of academic integrity on campuses (McCabe et al., 1999). One of these options is to install a modified honor code. A modified honor code must clearly communicate that academic integrity is a major institutional priority and must involve student participation on the conduct board (McCabe & Trevino, 2002). In a society that values individual freedom, Gary Pavela (1997) stresses the importance of giving students the voice in the execution of these codes.

However, modified honor codes and honor codes are not the only solutions to reducing academic dishonesty. Research has shown that at times these codes can instill a

fear of making mistakes and create other pressures for students. These additional pressures only add to the stress levels that students are already experiencing due to the implicit dire consequences of honor codes which are generally suspension or expulsion (McCabe et al., 1999; *Honor code 101*, n.d.). As an alternative to honor codes, McCabe et al. (2001) suggest that institutions create ethical communities that include clear expectations, "moral socialization," mutual respect between students and faculty, and extend privileges to students such as unproctored or self-scheduled exams. While these ethical communities mimic the cultures that honor codes and modified honor codes create, students may perceive them as being less rule-centric and more community-centric thereby helping create buy-in to the idea of an ethical campus culture.

Defining Values

Ethical dilemmas are value-laden decisions in which a person must choose between two appealing possibilities where both usually carry a desired outcome (Kidder, 1995). An example of an ethical dilemma would be choosing between studying for a test and spending time with friends. Students who choose to cheat constantly face such dilemmas involving competing "goods" that often challenge the student to choose between expedient actions like cheating and longer-term goods such as integrity and legitimate success. To counter growing levels of individualism, or focus on the self, colleges and universities have started devoting a large part of extracurricular offerings to character development such as leadership programs and volunteer and service opportunities (Astin and Antonio, 2004). Astin and Antonio (2004) define character development as developing in students "values and behaviors reflected in how we interact with each other and in the moral choices we make every day."

Socratic Dialogue suggests that moral behavior can be learned through ethical dialogues related to fundamental questions (Van Hooft, 1999). Therefore, it is important to have a solidified definition of values in order to have a discussion surrounding values and the role they play in academic integrity. Verplanken and Holland (2002) define values as "conceptions of desirable ways of behaving or desirable end states." Attitudes, on the other hand, determine how much one agrees with a statement instead of how important that statement itself is. When comparing values to attitudes, values are more generalized, can be ranked by importance and are central to one's self-concept or identity (Verplanken & Holland, 2002). Another definition by Rokeach (1979) as cited in Pascarella, Ethington, and Smart (1988) speaks to the centrality of values in influencing behavior. Rokeach (1979) defines a value as "a type of belief, centrally located within one's belief system, about how one ought or ought not to behave, or about some end-state of existence worth or not worth attaining" (Pascarella et al., 1988). Finally, in order to assert that a value is central to one's belief system certain criteria must be met including: choosing the value freely from other alternatives and with knowledge of the consequences of the choice, being happy enough with the choice to publicly states one's personal value, and finally, acting on the value so that it becomes an integrated pattern into one's daily life, which in essence is the definition of integrity (Smith, 1977).

Student Values

The majority of research surrounding student values can be divided into eight categories: sociopolitical dispositions, civic and community involvement, racial-ethnic attitudes, gender roles, attitudes toward homosexuality, religious attitudes and values, interest in culture and arts, and education and occupational values (Pascarella &

Terenzini, 2005). In their research Duffy and Sedlacek (2007) identified four different work values that college students identify with. These four work values are intrinsic, social, extrinsic, and prestige values. Intrinsic values focus on autonomy and interest in a job. Social values focus on working with others and contributing to society. Extrinsic values focus on money and job security and, finally, prestige values focus on acquiring a respectable occupation (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007). The four most important things that students looked for in their future employment related to intrinsic values (29%), followed by a high salary, which is considered an extrinsic value (20%), contributions to society, which is considered a social value, (15%), and the reputation of their job, which falls under prestige values (12%; Duffy and Sedlacek, 2007) In addition to their findings on important work values, 47% of students in Duffy and Sedlacek's (2007) research wanted to find a job that aligned with their values.

Various differences among race, gender, social class, and degree sought influenced the values that students found important later on in their work life. For example, men were more likely to place importance on extrinsic values whereas women were more likely to place importance on social values (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007). Students in low or high-income classes also rated extrinsic values more highly. African-American and Asian students placed more importance on extrinsic values while most White students found intrinsic values more important (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007). Also, students who were only seeking bachelor's degrees said they valued intrinsic values most, whereas students seeking higher degrees valued prestige values most (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007). Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) found that by their senior year, students focused less on the extrinsic value of jobs and more on the intrinsic opportunities such as

finding a good fit, autonomy in the workplace and taking on responsibility. Overall, a higher sense of personal responsibility in students generally indicated less inclination to cheat. This finding was especially true for women (Singg et al., 2005).

Studies by Astin (1993), Boyer (1994), and Levine (1994) have revealed a growing level of individualism among college students (as cited in Astin & Antonio, 2004). More recently, a study by Twenge (2006) found that in the past twenty years levels of narcissism have steadily increased leading students to favor "self-promotion over helping others," which supports previous research (as cited in Lilly & Schwartz, 2009, p. 10; Astin & Antonio, 2004). Levin (1994) argues that this trend towards individualism has made it increasingly more difficult for colleges and universities to continue helping students become humanitarian and civic-minded (as cited in Pascarella et al., 1988). However, studies by Pascarella et al. (1988) found that women continued to be more humanitarian/civic-minded in their values than men and minority students were more likely to develop humanitarian/civic values in college.

Duffy and Sedlacek (2007) also examined two value systems that students used to take in the world, open systems and closed systems. In closed value systems, students sought information that reaffirmed their beliefs and felt threatened by information that challenged their beliefs. Students who held open value systems looked for information that both affirmed and denied their beliefs. These students then took the new information they had acquired into consideration when re-assessing their value system. In their study, Duffy and Sedlacek (2007) found that religiously affiliated students were more likely to have closed value systems than their non-religiously affiliated counterparts. In addition,

although the finding was small but significant, males were more likely to have closed value systems than females (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007).

Value-Behavior Relationship

The relationship between student values and behavior is critical because it is this relationship that determines whether or not students will cheat when faced with ethical dilemmas inherent in academic integrity situations. More importantly, the value-behavior relationship should be taken into consideration when assessing student values to determine when values may actually influence students' behavior. Verplanken and Holland (2002) define value-behavioral choices as choosing the most favorable outcome guided by the relevant or most important value. The value-behavior relationship is closely intertwined with colleges and universities' focus on character development. In their study, Verplanken and Holland (2002) found that personal norms, personal involvement, level of moral reasoning, attitudes or preferences, attitude function, and attitude strength could all cause behavior to be inconsistent with one's value system. However, they found that the central values, which make up an individual's core group of values and are likely linked to strong feeling, most strongly influenced identity and behavior (Verplanken & Holland, 2002).

In order for values to influence behavior, Verplanken and Holland (2002) found that two conditions needed to be present: values needed to be central to an individual's identity and self-concept and they needed to be activated or brought to "the primary focus of attention." The research showed three ways that values could be activated to influence behavior. First, values influenced behavior when they were the main focus in a situation such as the values present in the argument for legalizing abortion (Verplanken &

Holland, 2002). Second, values were also activated when values were implied in the information given or through the situation at hand such as a student determining whether he should study or hang out with friends (Verplanken & Holland, 2002). And third, Verplanken and Holland (2002) found that a strong self-identity could activate central values.

In addition to value activation, Verplanken and Holland (2002) also determined two motives that could influence behavior, which they labeled implicit and self-attributed motives. Implicit motives presented themselves as trends over time. Verplanken and Holland (2002) found that they were more closely linked to one's self-concept and central values so implicit motives became synonymous with general habits. An example of implicit motives would be a person who places importance on being environmentally friendly and chooses the more environmentally friendly products when given the choice at the store. Self-attributed motives, unlike implicit motives, manifested themselves as an immediate response to a situation. Given this knowledge, it is possible that honor codes work because students are self-selecting to go to schools that hold values similar to their personal central values, thereby activating these values and causing the value-behavior relationship to be activated.

Impact of the Environment on Values

In 1936, Kurt Lewin proposed that behavior is a function of the person and the environment (B=*f* [P, E]; Banning and Bryner, 2001). This formula that describes the interdependence between the student and the college environment still plays a key role in assessing the impact that the college environment has on students. Another important theory related to the impact of the environment on behavior is Astin's input-environment-

outcome (I-E-O) model which suggests that both the inputs, factors that students come in with such as educational background and demographics, and the environment shape the outcomes which are students' knowledge, skills, values, and beliefs (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Studies have found that in addition to influencing behavior, the environment also influences student values even though students believe that the university only plays a small role in the development of their values (Lilly & Schwartz, 2009). In 1990, Biddle, Bank, and Slavings found that students' values change during their time as undergraduates based on the influence of their college environment. In addition, other studies have found that major, the college a student enrolls in, and the residence hall the student lives in all affect personal values. It is believed that these different areas create cultures that accentuate different values. Eventually, these cultures influence the students who become a part of them.

In their research, Biddle et al. (1990) found four major points related to the environment's influence on student values. First, Biddle et al. (1990) reported that modality affects reported values. "A value is implied when one finds strong associations among modally differing thoughts about a common topic," Biddle et al. (1990) reported. Therefore, the most accurate report of student values comes from triangulating three types: norms (I will be), preferences (I would like to be), and self-reference identity (I am).

Biddle et al. (1990) also found that choice of academic major affects a student's values, the second of the four points. Their findings suggested that values were more accentuated based on the major students had chosen. This implies that seniors' values should be more accentuated in specific areas related to their majors than freshmen whose

values might be more generalized. Unlike Biddle et al. (1990), Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) found that students' academic environments, such as the courses they take, are more important than major choice in influencing their values. For example, service-learning courses have been found to promote an increase in social activism and concern. Also, studies show that voluntary community service activities, as opposed to required service activities, can have positive effects on civic and community orientation attitudes and values (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). In addition, studies found that students who took women's studies courses showed a positive increase in their understanding of gender-role related issues (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Finally, research indicated that students who majored in the humanities showed a decrease in importance of extrinsic attitudes assigned to education (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005).

A third environmental factor that Biddle et al. (1990) identified as influencing values was on-campus experiences. Biddle et al. (1990) believe that exposure to on-campus experiences, especially experiential learning, played an important role in value development. However, Biddle et al. (1990) cautioned that campus events generally targeted specific values, so it was important to be intentional about learning outcomes in order to help students develop holistically.

Finally, Biddle et al. (1990) found that "structural properties," the physical environment of classrooms and residence halls, for example, had little effect on value shifts. Biddle et al. (1990) found that the engagement aspect of the college experience is the most important element that affects student values, which was supported by Pascarella et al.'s (1988) study on the influence of college on humanitarian/civic involvement values. In addition, a study by Lilly and Schwartz's (2009) found that there

did not seem to be any correlation between involvement and buy-in to university values without engagement. Involvement simply based on the sheer number of activities that a student participated in yielded little change in students' values. Engagement, more than involvement, is important in the development of personal values (Biddle et al., 1990; Kuh, 2000). Therefore, colleges and universities seeking particular learning outcomes such as character development should be finding means of actively engaging students in the learning process.

Pascarella et al.'s (1988) study found that participation in leadership education programs is especially important in helping students develop their values. Additionally, Pascarella et al. (1988) found that leadership programs positively impacted development of values regardless of pre-college factors. Astin and Antonio (2004) found that volunteering in high school predisposed students to develop humanitarian/civic values in college. In addition, Astin and Kent (1983) found that high degree aspirations and the opportunity for students to know faculty/administrators well gave them an advantage in developing their personal values in college (as cited in Pascarella et al., 1988). The "college experience [has] a significant, unique impact on the humanizing of values," Pascarella et al. (1988) state, but "a significant part of the lasting impact of college is realized by the extent to which collegiate experiences tend to channel individuals into influential post college environments." Other factors that were found to influence the development of values in college were gender, peer interactions, religious affiliation of the institution, exposure to interdisciplinary, ethnic and women's studies courses, interacting with students of different backgrounds and ethnicities, and participating in religious services or events (Astin & Antonio, 2004; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005).

Pascarella and Terenzini concluded that overall size and institutional selectivity did not seem to influence values. However, Kuh (2000) suggests that breaking larger institutions into smaller segments like residential colleges and creating more leadership opportunities would be beneficial for student-value development in the long run.

In a study in 2005, Chen studied various college and university lists of values essential to good character (as cited in Lilly & Schwartz, 2009). From this study, Chen (2005) compiled a list of 43 values that frequently were cited by colleges and universities and found that *independent* and *ambitious* were among some of the most cited values (as cited in Lilly and Schwartz, 2009). In addition, values related to community and helping others did not fall in the top ten most cited words (Chen, 2005; as cited in Lilly & Schwartz, 2009). Lilly and Schwartz (2009) theorize that affective words, such as empathetic, loving, altruistic/unselfish may have emerged at the bottom of the rankings due to the secular nature of the large public institution where Chen's (2005) study took place. Another explanation may be the positivistic orientation of many public institutions in which science is viewed as the solution for all problems (as cited in Lilly & Schwartz, 2009). Chen (2005) found that historically, private institutions have promoted an affective character in their mission and cultures more so than public institutions (as cited in Lilly & Schwartz, 2009). Other studies, including Bok's study in 1990, have found that "the diversity of large public institutions creates confusion in students regarding ethical dilemmas" because it is more difficult to promote a consistent message throughout the institution (as cited in Lilly & Schwartz, 2009, p. 10).

Additionally, in a 1990 study of campus communities, Boyer found six principles that campuses should strive for when defining their campus communities. The six principles

of an ideal community that Boyer (1990) identified are purposeful, open, just, disciplined, caring, and celebrative. Boyer (1990) describes a purposeful community as a community that is oriented towards learning and academics. An open community was described as one in which freedom of speech and expression was protected and civility affirmed (Boyer, 1990). In a just community individuals are honored and diversity is actively sought out. A disciplined community embodies a culture in which people hold themselves accountable, accept their obligations, and act for the greater good. He described a caring community as one that valued service to others and was supportive to its members. Finally, a celebrative community was described as a community in which old traditions and rituals were honored and remembered and new traditions were created and celebrated as the community changed and evolved. Utilizing these six principles, Boyer (1990) believed these communities would create the upmost learning environments for higher education. Therefore college and universities, specifically those whose mission focuses on character development, should be more intentional about the promotion of university values to their students and the campus community in order to develop more morally conscious citizens.

Both individual and contextual factors influence students' choices surrounding academic integrity. Individual factors that influence students' decisions to cheat are a student's age, GPA, parents' level of education, participation in athletics and involvement in extracurricular activities. Contextual factors that influence cheating included involvement in fraternities/sororities, peer behavior and peer disapproval. In addition, McCabe et al. (1999) found that students' general perceptions of cheating at different types of institutions were similar. This finding implies that students at both honor code

and non-code schools hold a common ideal that, ethically, cheating is wrong. However, there is still a disconnect between students' general attitudes towards cheating and their situational behaviors.

Studies by Astin (1993), Boyer (1994) and Levine (1994) found a growing trend in individualism, which suggests why levels of cheating have increased in the past decade since individualism supports finding means of moving oneself ahead as opposed to improving the lot of the general community (as cited in Astin & Antonio, 2004). In order for one's values to influence behavior, the values must be central to one's belief system and must be activated by the surrounding environment. Several factors, such as type of classes taken such as women's studies courses, involvement and engagement in extracurricular activities such as service opportunities and leadership programs, and interaction with faculty and administrators, influence whether students will engage in cheating (Pascarella & Terezini, 2005). For example, serving on an honor board would likely activate values related to honor and integrity especially if the environment of the campus promoted these values as is typically seen at honor code schools. Gender and religion were also found to heavily influence values. Though attitudes about academic integrity are generally the same across diverse campuses, the situational environment of the individual campus community may well act as a deterrent to cheating where the general values of honesty or integrity are widely held by the students, faculty, and staff. According to the model suggested by Bertram Gallant and Drinan (2006), institutions may have the aforementioned situational environment and over time evolve from a state of recognition and commitment to institutionalizing the problem, in this case academic dishonesty, and accepting the remedies.

Chapter 2: Method and Results

Method

This study examined students' values at honor code schools to see if there was a change in values from freshman to senior year and to see if student values at honor code schools differed from a previously collected set of norm values. Results for this study were compiled using the Values Arrangement List (VAL) created by Dr. John P. Golden, a professor of business at Florida Gulf Coast University. The purpose of the VAL is to help students determine a ranking of their values based on their responses to forced choice value questions. The Institutional Review Board at Appalachian State University approved the study on October 20, 2009.

The inventory was administered through a link from the Golden website (goldenllc.com) using a code provided by the researcher. The researcher invited 1,693 undergraduate students at two private, honor code schools to participate in the study. The group consisted of 891 freshmen and 802 seniors. The Dean of Students at each institution forwarded the survey to their students along with a cover memo from the researcher via email.

The schools were selected from the membership of the Center for Academic Integrity (CAI) as well as from peer institutions of these schools in order to assure that schools were similar in demographics and that their honor codes fit the definition given by the CAI. The honor codes at the two schools were compared to ensure that they contained similar elements including a pledge, unproctored examinations, a peer reporting clause, and a peer-run honor council (McCabe & Trevino, 1997). These

elements are consistent with the definition of an honor code by the Center for Academic Integrity (*Honor code 101*, n.d.).

The survey included the VAL as well as demographic questions that asked for the participant's gender, age, year, major, and race/ethnicity in order to determine that the sample was representative of the campus culture. The VAL contains two sets of value lists each containing 21 values relating to either life or operational values. Operational values are defined as "a means to an end and are associated with day-to-day activities" while life values are defined as "the end state and are associated with ultimate aspirations, or what individuals strive to maintain or achieve over their life span" (Golden, 2006, p. 3). The first half of questions on the VAL focused on life values and the second half of questions focused on operational values. In each of the questions, participants were asked to rank five values on a scale of one to five, where one indicated their most important value and five indicated their least important value of the given set. Each question was accompanied by the definition of the values for that question. No two values could have the same rank in the same question since the questions were forced choice. After the participant completed all of the questions, the values were ranked by the software program through the Golden, LLC website.

A normative sample collected by Golden (2006) was used as a norm group for comparison. Golden's norm sample consisted of 4,268 participants. Of the 4,268 participants, 61% were male and 39% were female and the majority (89.2%) identified themselves as White. The group closely resembled the demographics of the research sample in ethnicity. However, the sample collected by Golden had a larger percentage of

male participants and the average age for the norm sample was 36 while the average age of participants in this study was 20.

Upon completion of the inventory by participants, the values were ranked from one to 21 by the instrument software keeping the two value sets, life and operational, separate. The program then presented an aggregate list for the life and operational values based on the means of individual rankings by each student. Life and operational values were compared separately in four ways searching for statistically significant differences in responses. First, freshman values were compared to senior values to determine if there were any significant differences. Second, values were compared by gender. Third, mean rankings were compared by class and gender to determine if there were any significant differences in the interaction between class and gender. Finally, freshman and seniors' mean rankings for both life and operational values were compared to the mean rankings of the sample collected by Golden (2006).

Results

Sample.

Freshman and seniors were surveyed at two small private liberal arts colleges with enrollments under 2,000 students and honor codes containing an honor pledge, unproctored exams, a peer reportage clause, and a peer-run honor council, as indicators of a "true honor code" school based on the definition by the CAI (*Honor code 101*, n.d). The survey link was sent out through the class list serve by the Dean of Students at each respective institution to all of the enrolled freshman and senior classes. Of the 1,693 surveys sent, 310 were returned. However, 43 of these were incomplete and thus had to be discarded from the sample. Of the students surveyed, 267 (130 freshman and 137

seniors) returned completed surveys yielding a 16% return rate. The demographic breakdowns reflect the 267 surveys that were fully completed. Seventy-two percent of respondents were female and 28% were male. Both institutions report a 1:1 male to female ratio. Table 1 shows a breakdown of the freshman and senior classes that completed and returned the survey by gender. Of the 267 respondents, 92% indentified as White, 4% identified as Black, 2% identified as multiracial, 2% identified as Hispanic, and 1% identified as Asian as shown in Table 2. Table 3 shows a breakdown of the reported ages of participants. The mean age of participants was 20. Of the participating institutions, one reported a median age of 19 and the other reported a median age of 20.

A normative sample collected by Golden (2006), the creator of the VAL, was also used as a control group for further comparisons. This sample consisted of 4,268 participants with a mean age of 35.5 (Golden, 2006). Of the 97.4% of the sample that reported their race or ethnic group, 89.2% identified as White, 4.8% as African American, 2.3% as Asian/Pacific islander, 2.2% as Hispanic, 0.4% as Native American, and 1.1% identified as "Other" (Golden, 2006).

Findings.

Multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to compare mean rankings of males and females and freshmen and seniors. MANOVA was chosen to guard against type 1 error that could result from making multiple t-test comparisons. Life and operational values were analyzed separately. Institutions were not analyzed separately. The analysis of life values indicated no statistically significant differences between classes from freshman to senior year. However, results indicated a significant difference in gender for life values (Pillai's Trace = .292, $F\ (20,144) = 5.029$, $p < .001$), which

implies a difference in the rankings of males and females on their life value rankings. The data from Golden's (2006) norm group reported a similar result between male and females' life values showing a significant difference in 15 of the 21 values. There was no significant difference in the interaction between class and gender for life values in the present study.

MANOVA comparison of males and females and freshmen and seniors for operational values also showed a significant difference in gender (Pillai's Trace = .292, $F(20,144) = 5.029$, $p < .001$), which indicates a difference in males and females rankings of their operational values. This aligns with the norm group from Golden's (2006) study that found a significant difference in 19 of 21 operational values for males and females. There was also a significant difference in operational values between freshmen and seniors (Pillai's Trace = .149, $F(20,144) = 2.134$, $p < .005$). The univariate F tests showed a significant difference between freshmen and seniors for the operational values *competency* ($F = 4.363$, $df = (1,265)$, $p < .05$) and *drive* ($F = 8.745$, $df = (1,265)$, $p < .005$). Seniors ranked *competency* higher than freshmen and freshmen ranked *drive* higher than seniors. For operational values, there was no significant interaction between class and gender.

An independent samples t-test using sample size, mean and standard deviation was used to compare the Golden norm group mean rankings for life and operational values to the mean rankings collected in this study herein referred to as the freshman group mean rankings and the senior group mean rankings. Again, life and operational values were analyzed separately. The same norm group was used to compare life and operational values for freshmen and seniors. In order to avoid type 1 error, the

significance value was adjusted to a more conservative *p*-value of $p < .002$. Using the Bonferroni procedure, this new *p* value was found by dividing the commonly accepted significance value of $p < .05$ by the number of values being compared, in this case 21 per set.

For operational values, no significant differences were found after comparing the freshman and senior rankings to Golden's norm rankings. The rankings for operational values as well as the means and standard deviations can be found in Table 4. For life values, various significant differences emerged between the surveyed freshman values and norm values ($p < .002$) as shown in Table 5. Freshmen ranked *fellowship, social service, community,* and *aesthetics* higher than the norm group. Freshmen also indicated a lower preference for *health, self worth,* and *fame* than the norm group. Seniors also showed a significant difference in life values from the norm group ($p < .002$) as shown in Table 5. Seniors ranked *fellowship, social service, community,* and *aesthetics* more highly than the norm group. Additionally, seniors ranked *self worth, health, achievement, wealth,* and *fame* lower than the norm group.

Chapter 3: Conclusions and Suggestions for Further Study

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine if student values at honor code schools changed from freshman to senior year. The assumption was that students' values at honor code schools would change from freshman to senior year to more closely reflect the institutions' promoted values. The study found that, in the case of the two honor code schools surveyed, there appeared to be no significant institutional impact on life values from freshman to senior year. Operational values showed significant changes in two

values from freshman to senior year: *drive* and *competency*. Freshmen valued *drive* more than seniors and seniors valued *competency* more than freshmen. Further results showed that operational values of freshmen and seniors at code schools are not significantly different from the norm values collected by Golden (Golden, 2006). However, life values were found to be significantly different for both freshmen and seniors from the norm value rankings. Both freshmen and seniors in the survey for this study rated *fellowship, social service,* and *community* higher than the norm group. Additionally, both freshmen and seniors ranked *self-worth* and *health* lower than the norm group and seniors also ranked *achievement* and *wealth* lower than the norm group.

The values *drive* and *competency* are not closely related in the literature to academic integrity. These changes in values likely emerged due to the normal and expected development of students while enrolled in college (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). In addition, previous research has shown that by their senior year of college, students tend to place more importance on intrinsic values than extrinsic values (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005).

Golden (2006) defines *competency* as "being productive, efficient, and skillful" and *drive* as "being industrious and goal-directed." Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) found that by senior year students place more importance on being autonomous and taking on responsibility in the work place and finding a good fit. Therefore, seniors may value *competency* more than freshmen because by being competent they are better able to meet the demands of their preferred work environment. Meanwhile, normative student development literature between the traditional freshman and senior year may support

freshmen's heightened interest in *drive* given that freshmen are beginning to navigate the college environment, explore possible major options, and set goals for their career paths.

The differences in life values between freshmen and seniors from those of the norm group, especially the heightened importance of *fellowship, social service*, and *community* among all students surveyed, may indicate that students attending honor code schools are self-selecting into the environments fostered by these types of institutions. The literature of academic integrity suggests that honor codes are more successful when everyone in the community buys-in. These schools frequently promote the values of *service*, *community*, *responsibility* and *integrity*. However, the fact that students' operational values at honor code schools are not significantly different from the values of the norm group may imply that the values guiding the daily behavior of students at honor code schools may not be very different from the values of students at non-code schools. The question then becomes why are levels of academic integrity lower at honor code schools than at non-code schools? In the case of the two schools surveyed for this study, it appears that academic integrity may be less related to values and more linked to the environment promoted at these two institutions. It may be inferred that such an environment activates students' values so that their behavior related to academic integrity aligns with them. Additionally, it is possible that students with such values are attracted to the idea of an honor code thereby allowing the institution to fulfill its standards related to academic integrity. Further research would need to be done to determine if this is the case.

Limitations of the Study

The primary limitation for this study was related to sample size and therefore the total N of the survey. Despite efforts by the researcher, only two schools (both code schools) of the four code and non-code schools originally agreeing to participate actually did so. Additionally, the loss of the two non-code schools made a comparison between code and non-code schools impossible. This fact made it necessary to use the more general norm group collected by Golden (2006) in his original study. It should also be noted that the median age for the participants in the Golden (2006) study was 36 while the median age for participants in the present study was twenty. Values reported could potentially have been affected by the 16 year age gap as Golden's research showed that values seem to change over the course of one's lifetime based on the experiences they are going through. Another difference that should be noted was the gender difference between Golden's (2006) sample and the sample gathered by the researcher for this study. In Golden's (2006) study, the majority of participants were male while in the researcher's sample the majority of participants were female. This difference in gender could have also skewed the data given the fact that research shows that values differ by gender. The last significant limitation was that data was self-reported by the participants. Although McCabe (1999) suggests that self-reporting seems to be an effective strategy for learning about academic integrity, there is still the possibility of bias in the surveys as students reported their personal values.

In the future, researchers could repeat the same study with a larger sample size including honor code schools as well as a more appropriate comparison with a sample of non-code schools to see if there are any significant differences in values from freshman to senior year at non-code schools and to determine if life and operational values of

freshman and seniors at non-code schools deviate from the norm group rankings. Additionally, further studies could seek more data concerning value activation to see if this is one of the factors contributing to the disparity researchers have reported in levels of academic integrity between code schools and non-code schools.

Implications for Practice

Although this study is limited in how far it can be generalized, one significant finding in the results was that students at honor code schools appeared to have very similar operational values, values that guide their day to day life, to people from a norm sample who were from a variety of educational backgrounds. Included in the top three values for freshmen, seniors, and the norm group were the values: *honesty, loyalty, affection,* and *accountability*, with *honesty* being listed as the top-most important value for all three groups. This finding suggests that students at non-code campuses may also be likely to indicate *honesty* as one of their most important values. This can be useful for faculty and staff at college campuses to be aware of when they are having conversations with students about academic integrity issues or other related sorts of incidences. Speaking to students' values may help get the purpose of the conversation across better in the long term than simply discussing punitive consequences related to their actions.

Research also shows that exposing students to specialized courses (e.g. women's studies courses) and actively engaging them in extracurricular activities, specifically leadership development programs, helps activate their central values (Pascarella & Terezini, 2005). This can be a useful tool for practitioners when developing new courses and programs. In addition to developing learning outcomes it may also be important to determine which activities may activate specific values. For example, participation in a

student-run honor council may heighten students' awareness of values such as *honesty*, *fairness*, and *accountability*. This could help colleges and universities more strongly integrate the values that many express as central to their campuses in their mission and vision statements. Also, knowing that students appear to self-select into certain environments, it is highly likely that the environment students are selecting into will further heighten and activate the values that they currently hold. Knowing what values are important to the students at an institution and coupling that with student development theory, especially in regards to character development, could provide administrators with valuable questions and insights about practice with students; ultimately, helping with buy-in for new initiatives as well as helping to tailor the development of programs to better meet the campus' needs.

References

Astin, H.S., & Antonio, A.L. (2004). The impact of college on character development [Electronic version]. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 122* (2), 55-64.

Banning, J.H., & Bryner, C.E. (2001). *A framework for organizing the scholarship of campus ecology*. Retrieved March 24, 2009, from http://www.colostate.edu/Dept/SAHE/JOURNAL2/2001/Framework.htm

Betram Gallant, T., & Drinan, P. (2006). Institutionalizing academic integrity: administrator perceptions and institutional actions [Electronic version]. *NASPA Journal, 43*(4), 61-81. Retrieved March 24, 2009, from http://journals.naspa.org/jsarp/vol43/iss4/art5/

Biddle, B.J., Bank, B.J., & Slavings, R.L. (1990). Modality of thought, campus experiences, and the development of values [Electronic version]. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*(4), 671-682. Retrieved March 24, 2009, from PsycARTICLES database.

Boyer, Ernest. (1990). *Campus life: In search of community*. Commissioned by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Davis, S.F., Pierce, M.C., Yandell, L.R., Arnow, P.S., & Loree, A. (1995). Cheating in college and the type A personality; A reevaluation [Electronic version]. *College Student Journal, 29*(4), 493-497.

Duffy, R.D., & Sedlacek, W.E. (2007). The work values of first year college students: Exploring group differences [Electronic version]. *Career Development Quarterly, 55*(4), 359-364. Retrieved March 24, 2009, from PsychINFO database.

Dufresne, R.L. (2004). An action learning perspective on effective implementation of academic honor codes [Electronic version]. *Group & Organization Management, 29*(2), 201-218. Retrieved February 2, 2009, from PsychINFO database.

Fundamental Values Project (n.d.). Retrieved September 8, 2009, from http://www.academicintegrity.org/fundamental_values_project/index.php

Golden, J. P. (2006). *Values Arrangement List (VAL): Administrator's Guide*. Harcourt Assessment, Inc.

Honor code 101: An introduction to the elements of traditional honor codes, modified honor codes and academic integrity policies (n.d.). Retrieved February 11, 2009, from http://www.academicintegrity.org/educational_resources/honor_code_101.php

History (n.d.). Retrieved February 11, 2009, from http://www.academicintegrity.org/about_us/history.php

Lilly C. B., & Schwartz, R. (2009). Perceptions of values at a public research university [Electronic version]. *Journal of College & Character, 10*(4), 1-14. Retrieved October 6, 2009, from http://journals.naspa.org/jcc/vol10/iss4/9/

Kidder, R. (1995). *How good people make tough choices: resolving the dilemmas of ethical living*. New York, NY: Fireside.

Kuh, G. (2000). Do environments matter? A comparative analysis of the impression of different types of colleges and universities on character [Electronic version]. *Journal of College and Character, 1*(4), Retrieved March 16, 2010, from http://journals.naspa.org/jcc/vol1/iss4/

McCabe, D.L., & Trevino, L.K. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences [Electronic version]. *Journal of Higher Education, 64*(5), 522–538.

McCabe, D.L., & Trevino, L.K. (1997). Individual and contextual influences on academic dishonesty: A multi-campus investigation [Electronic version]. *Research in Higher Education, 38*(3), 379-396.

McCabe, D.L., & Trevino, L.K. (2002). Honesty and honor codes [Electronic version]. *Academe, 88*(1), 37-41. Retrieved February 11, 2009, from ERIC database.

McCabe, D.L., Trevino, L.K., & Butterfield, K.D. (1999). Academic integrity in honor code and non-honor code environments: A qualitative investigation [Electronic version]. *The Journal of Higher Education, 70*(2), 211-234. Retrieved January 27, 2009, from JSTOR database.

McCabe, D.L., Trevino, L.K., & Butterfield, K.D. (2001). Cheating in academic institutions: A decade of research [Electronic version]. *Ethics & Behavior, 11*(3), 219-232.

Pascarella, E.T., Ethington, C.A., & Smart, J.C. (1988). The influence of college on humanitarian/civic involvement values [Electronic version]. *The Journal of Higher Education, 59*(4), 412-437. Retrieved March 17, 2010, from JSTOR database.

Pascarella, E.T., & Terenzini, P.T. (2005). *How college affects students*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pavela, G. (1997). Applying the power of association on campus: A model code of academic integrity [Electronic version]. *Journal of College and University Law,*

24(1), 1-22. Retrieved February 3, 2009, from http://www.jpo.umd.edu/docs/toomuch2_wrk.pdf

Rokeach, M. (Ed.). (1979). *Understanding human values*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Singg, S., Thomas, S., & Null, M. (2005). Relationship between academic dishonesty and student personal responsibility [Electronic version]. *American Association of Behavioral and Social Sciences, 8*(3). Retrieved February 23, 2009, from http://aabss.org/journal/2005

Smith, M. (1977). *A practical guide to value clarification*. La Jolla, CA: University Associates, Inc.

Van Hooft, S. (1999). Socratic dialogue as collegial reasoning [Electronic version]. *Practical Philosophy, 10*. Retrieved March 24, 2009 from http://www.pantaneto.co.uk/issue10/vanhooft.htm

Verplanken, B., Holland, R.W. (2002). Motivated decision making: Effects of activation and self-centrality of values on choices and behavior [Electronic version]. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(3), 434-447. Retrieved March 24, 2009, from PsycARTICLES database.

Table 1

Gender Demographics by Class Standing

Gender	Freshman	Senior	%
Female	92	101	72.28
Male	38	36	27.72
Totals (*N*=267)	130	137	

Table 2

Race Demographics

Age	Count	%
Asian	2	0.75%
Black	10	3.75%
Hispanic	5	1.87%
Multiracial	6	2.25%
White	244	91.39%
Totals (*N* = 267)	267	

Table 3

Age Demographics

Age	Count	%
17	2	0.75
18	66	24.72
19	58	21.72
20	11	4.12
21	77	28.84
22	46	17.23
23	3	1.12
24	3	1.12
40	1	0.37
Mean	20.05	
Totals (*N*=267)	267	

Table 4

Comparison of Freshman and Senior Operational Value Rankings to the Norm Group

Class	Rank	M	SD	Significant
		Accountability		
Freshman	4	8.25	5.39	
Senior	3	7.44	3.88	
Norm	2	7.04	4.38	
		Affection		
Freshman	3	7.35	5.39	
Senior	4	7.79	5.44	
Norm	6	9.43	6.03	
		Autonomy		
Freshman	14	11.85	6.17	
Senior	10	10.77	5.61	
Norm	8	10.36	5.77	
		Competency		
Freshman	13	11.77	4.62	
Senior	8	10.21	4.12	
Norm	4	8.59	4.17	
		Courage		

Freshman	17	12.81	5.39
Senior	15	12.37	5.69
Norm	20	13.86	5.64
		Courtesy	
Freshman	6	10.02	4.57
Senior	12	11.19	4.61
Norm	12	11.26	4.85
		Creativity	
Freshman	19	13.38	5.15
Senior	19	13.65	5.50
Norm	14	12.11	5.43
		Discipline	
Freshman	15	12.01	4.77
Senior	17	12.75	4.99
Norm	15	12.18	5.17
		Drive	
Freshman	7	10.29	5.18
Senior	14	12.16	5.34
Norm	11	11.07	5.12
		Fairness	
Freshman	10	10.94	4.54
Senior	5	9.82	4.12

Norm	5	8.86	4.39
		Flexibility	
Freshman	18	12.88	4.35
Senior	18	12.85	3.84
Norm	9	10.88	4.18
		Forgiveness	
Freshman	8	10.33	5.55
Senior	13	11.59	5.67
Norm	17	12.64	5.20
		Honesty	
Freshman	1	5.33	4.19
Senior	1	4.50	3.38
Norm	1	4.22	3.74
		Humor	
Freshman	16	12.69	5.35
Senior	16	12.57	5.33
Norm	19	13.75	5.34
		Knowledge	
Freshman	5	9.99	5.10
Senior	6	10.00	4.77
Norm	7	9.82	5.13
		Loyalty	

Freshman	2	6.71	4.64
Senior	2	6.70	4.49
Norm	3	8.34	5.03
		Obedience	
Freshman	21	16.33	4.81
Senior	21	17.97	3.92
Norm	21	17.91	3.82
		Order	
Freshman	20	14.67	5.02
Senior	20	14.87	4.85
Norm	18	13.69	5.08
		Reason	
Freshman	9	10.55	5.24
Senior	7	10.19	5.50
Norm	10	10.92	4.91
		Service	
Freshman	12	11.53	5.36
Senior	11	11.09	5.36
Norm	16	12.58	4.53
		Tolerance	
Freshman	11	11.32	5.23
Senior	9	10.53	5.56

Norm	13	11.42	4.43

Note. No significant differences in operational values. A lower rank number indicates a value is considered more important.

Table 5

Comparison of Freshman and Senior Life Value Rankings to the Norm Group

Class	Rank	M	SD	Significant
		Achievement		
Freshman	10	9.45	4.26	
Senior	9	10.23	4.37	*
Norm	8	8.81	3.74	
		Adventure		
Freshman	16	13.88	4.60	
Senior	16	13.66	5.02	
Norm	16	14.76	4.67	
		Aesthetics		
Freshman	17	15.48	4.10	*
Senior	17	15.48	4.13	*
Norm	21	17.31	3.57	
		Community		
Freshman	15	12.05	3.90	*
Senior	14	11.80	4.22	*
Norm	19	15.88	3.40	
		Equality		
Freshman	12	11.42	4.73	

Senior	10	10.28	4.48	
Norm	11	10.39	3.43	
		Fame		
Freshman	21	18.32	3.67	*
Senior	21	18.51	3.13	*
Norm	20	16.60	4.16	
		Family		
Freshman	1	4.84	4.19	
Senior	2	4.63	3.85	
Norm	1	4.10	3.42	
		Fellowship		
Freshman	5	7.88	3.85	*
Senior	4	7.36	3.58	*
Norm	9	9.13	3.73	
		Freedom		
Freshman	8	9.06	4.41	
Senior	8	9.32	4.36	
Norm	7	8.23	3.98	
		Happiness		
Freshman	3	6.07	3.26	
Senior	3	6.07	3.81	
Norm	5	6.87	3.48	

		Health		
Freshman	9	9.24	3.76	*
Senior	7	8.35	3.96	*
Norm	4	6.55	4.00	
		Love		
Freshman	2	5.14	4.20	
Senior	1	4.44	3.89	
Norm	2	5.45	3.97	
		Nature		
Freshman	20	16.34	3.85	
Senior	18	15.80	4.01	
Norm	18	15.64	3.89	
		Peace		
Freshman	11	11.34	4.32	
Senior	13	11.50	4.57	
Norm	12	11.07	4.36	
		Pleasure		
Freshman	14	11.67	4.36	
Senior	15	12.49	4.21	
Norm	13	12.43	3.90	
		Power		
Freshman	19	16.12	4.68	

Senior	20	16.73	3.96	
Norm	17	15.58	4.60	
		Self-Worth		
Freshman	7	9.02	4.29	*
Senior	5	7.84	4.59	*
Norm	3	6.30	3.88	
		Social Service		
Freshman	13	11.46	4.64	*
Senior	12	11.31	4.73	*
Norm	14	13.76	4.18	
		Spirituality		
Freshman	6	8.71	8.09	
Senior	11	10.65	7.44	
Norm	10	9.98	7.34	
		Wealth		
Freshman	18	15.91	4.52	
Senior	19	16.60	3.56	*
Norm	15	14.61	4.46	
		Wisdom		
Freshman	4	7.63	4.02	
Senior	6	7.96	3.53	
Norm	6	7.56	3.77	

Note. *$p < .002$. A lower rank number indicates a value is considered more important.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Michelle Marie Navas was born on March 4, 1986 in San Juan, Puerto Rico. She is the daughter of Jorge and Elaine Navas. She attended Davidson College where she graduated in 2008 with a Bachelor of Science in Mathematics. In 2010 she completed her Master of Arts in College Student Development at Appalachian State University. Her interest in academic integrity and student values stems from the importance of the Honor Code at her alma mater, Davidson College. She currently works as a First-Year Area Coordinator for the Office of the Dean of Students – Residence Life at the University of Virginia.